REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants thank the Examiner for his Final Office Action mailed April 11, 2005. This paper confirms the prior withdrawal (without prejudice) of Claims 3, 7-9, and 12-20 from consideration (until such times as base claims are allowed). Claims 4, 6, and 11 are newly cancelled (along with previously cancelled Claim 1) and Claims 2 and 5 are amended and are discussed further herein. Claims 21-31 have been added. Thus, **Claims 2, 5, 10 and 21-31** are under consideration in the application. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration and allowance are hereby requested.

The Drawings:

The Office Action again asserts that the semiconductor integrated circuit comprising memory devices such as in Claim 2 (e.g., as recited in Claim 10) are not shown in the figures. The applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants point out that this feature is expressly and **schematically** depicted in Figure 5 and further described in the discussions pertaining thereto. Such schematic depictions are permitted and, in fact, are encouraged (for example, electronic circuit depictions and computer flows can be depicted this way). The fact that the drawing (Fig. 5) does not precisely resemble a perfect artistic rendering of an integrated circuit is not relevant to a schematic drawing. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the "undepicted" feature is in fact shown by the drawings. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

All pending Claims 2, 5, 10, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. §§ 102(a) as being anticipated by *Yamamoto et al* (US Pub. No. 2002/0153579)(hereinafter *Yamamoto*).

Claim 2 amended to include the limitations of a dielectric gate stack with a first and second layer sandwiching the electron trapping layer therebetween wherein the "the first and second layer [are] each formed of a material selected from among silicon carbide, silicon oxynitride, silicon nitride, and amorphous silicon nitride". Also recited is the limitation of "an electron trapping material selected from zirconium oxide and aluminum oxide". This combination of elements is not present in the cited art. *Yamamoto* does not teach or suggest the advantages of the sandwiched zirconium oxide or aluminum oxide electron trapping layer nor the particular sandwiching materials (e.g., amorphous silicon nitrides). Accordingly, the

applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not teach all of the claim limitations and thus cannot support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

Moreover, as to **Claim 5 (which is** dependent on Claim 2) the further limitation of first and second layers of the dielectric stack comprising silicon nitride is not taught in the cited art. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 5 be withdrawn.

As to **Claim 10**, the schematic drawing of Figure 5 discloses and shows an integrated circuit of which the claimed memory device can form a part. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

New Claims:

Claims 21-31 are new claims directed to specific configurations and materials. Support for these claims can be found throughout the specification. For example, at page 6, in paragraph [0023] or at paragraph [0025] at page 8. In view of the underlying patentability of Claim 2 (upon which these claims depend) it is respectfully submitted that for at least these reasons that Claims 21-28 are also allowable of the art of record.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention as presently presented is patentable over the art of record and that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner, for any reason, wish to contact the undersigned, he is cordially invited to do so at his convenience. Moreover, if the Examiner has any continuing concerns regarding this case, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (650) 961-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Francis T. Kalinski II
Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (650) 961-8300